- 1	
1	Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker) Care of: 30650 Rancho California Road #406-251 Temecula, California [92591] non-domestic without the United States Email: team@walkernovagroup.com
	Care of: 30650 Rancho California Road #406-251
2	Temecula, California [92591]
3	<i>non-domestic without</i> the <u>U</u> nited <u>S</u> tates
	Email: team@walkernovagroup.com
4	
5	Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party
٠ ١	I INIUTEU FUTIV

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

27

28

FILED

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

08/17/2025

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY AP DEPUTY

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED THROUGH THE ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMISSION SYSTEM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Vs.
Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman,
Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V
Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt,
Robert Gell, Nicholas Gruwell, Joseph
Sinz, Michael Hestrin, Miranda
Thomson,
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF, THE
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, SOUTHWEST JUSTICE
CENTER, FERGUSON PRAET &
SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION, Does 1-100 Inclusive
Defendant(s).

Case No. 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA

VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND
FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT
JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, AS A MATTER
OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL RULES OF
CIVIL PROCEDURE 54, 55, AND 56

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE — IN EQUITY ONLY — EQUITY JURISDICTION PRESERVED)

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

This matter is brought in **equity**, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of this Court as authorized by **Article III**, **Section 2** of the Constitution of the United States. All statutory jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of Record. All rights are reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308.

25 COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker), a natural, freeborn,

living man on the land and soil of the *De'Jure* Republic, one of the people of the <u>united</u>

states of America, and the Real Party in Interest, Respondent, and Injured Party in this

matter. Kevin proceeds sui juris, by specially limited appearing only in proper private

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

capacity, not as a 14th Amendment "U.S. citizen," not as a corporate "person," not pro se, **not** pro per, not as a "resident," and **not** through any fictitious legal construct — but as **one** of the people, the Plaintiff, Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, and Creditor, standing on the land and soil jurisdiction of the **De Jure Republic**, without adhesion, contract, or submission to any foreign corporate entity posing as government. Real Party In Interest invokes this Court's original jurisdiction in equity, as vested under Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America and demands adjudication according to the facts, truth, common law, the Bill of Rights, and applicable constitutional guarantees. Accordingly, this Court sits in **equity alone**. There exists no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. Plaintiffs have been robbed of their private trust property, dispossessed without lawful jurisdiction, denied due process, and obstructed from every statutory avenue of redress. The law provides no substitute. The statutes are exhausted, the remedies at law are illusory, and the fraud perpetrated under color of law can only be corrected by equity. As the Supreme Court has long held, "Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy" (Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)); and where law fails, "equity steps in to do justice." Thus, this Court has exclusive, unavoidable jurisdiction in equity to restore possession, quiet title, vacate void acts, and grant full restitution. Any refusal to act would not merely deny justice — it would ratify theft, fraud, and treason under color of law. Equity alone remains. There is no alternate avenue. I. INTRODUCTION Plaintiff and Real Party In Interest, proceeding sui juris, hereby moves and demands entry of Summary and Default Judgment in Equity as a matter of law, pursuant to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, common law maxims, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54, 55, and 56. This action arises from Plaintiff's **364-page Amended Verified Complaint** (Dkt. 47), together with multiple Verified Affidavits (Dkts. 11, 14, 17, 20, 43, 44), all duly filed, noticed, and served upon Defendants — including the **People of the State of California**,

Riverside County Sheriff, Southwest Justice Center, prosecutors, deputies, and judges. 2 Summons were issued and perfected as of May–June 2025 (Dkts. 23–40). 3 Defendants, though properly served and afforded every opportunity, have failed, refused, and neglected to plead, answer, or otherwise defend. No opposition has been entered. Plaintiff further filed a Renewed Verified Motion and Demand to Vacate Denial of Injunctive Relief under FRCP 5 60(b)(1) and (b)(6) (Dkt. 46) on June 20, 2025, which fully addressed the Winter v. NRDC factors for equitable relief. That motion likewise remains pending, ignored, and unrebutted. 8 The law, equity, and commerce are not silent on this point: Silence is confession. 9 Default is admission. 10 Unrebutted verified affidavits stand as truth. 11 Accordingly, Defendants stand in default and dishonor, and judgment must be entered 12 for Plaintiff as a matter of right, not discretion. Judicial inaction only compounds the 13 default, constituting constructive fraud and obstruction. No genuine dispute of fact exists. 14 15 Relief is compelled nunc pro tunc to the date of filing. II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL RECORD 16 1. Complaint and Amended Complaint Filed 17 18 Plaintiff filed his original Verified Complaint (Dkt. 1) and later filed the 116-page 19 Amended Verified Complaint (Dkt. 47) with exhibits on July 6, 2025. Both complaints have been duly served upon defendants and stand verified and unrebutted, making 20 21 every allegation therein admitted by operation of law and equity. **Summons Issued and Service Perfected** 22 23 Between May 29 and June 1, 2025, summons were issued for each Defendant (Dkts. 24–40). Plaintiff filed Verified Proofs of Service (Dkts. 23, 44), establishing lawful 24 notice and binding jurisdiction. No Defendant has challenged service. They are therefore 25 26 deemed properly before this Court and bound to respond. Affidavits Confirming Defendants' Unlawful Conduct 27 28 Plaintiff filed multiple sworn, verified affidavits documenting Defendants' unlawful actions:

Page 3 of 14

compounds constitutes constructive fraud, obstruction of justice, and ultra vires dishonor. In equity, silence where action is required equals consent. By refusing to adjudicate, the Court has itself entered judicial default, forfeiting jurisdictional legitimacy.

5

6

4

III. LEGAL STANDARD

• Rule 55: Default judgment is mandatory when a party fails to plead or

• Rule 54(c): "Judgment shall grant the relief to which each party is entitled, even if

the party has not demanded that relief in its pleadings." The Court is bound to enter

the full measure of relief to which Plaintiff is entitled by law and equity, irrespective

otherwise defend. Defendants, having been duly served and given opportunity,

have filed no answer and have failed to rebut Plaintiff's Verified Affidavits and

Verified Complaint. By operation of law, they stand in default, and judgment

• Rule 56(a): Summary judgment is required when there is no genuine dispute as to

any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Here,

every material fact has been sworn by affidavit, served upon Defendants, and left

unrebutted. In law and commerce, unrebutted truth is final judgment. No dispute

1. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Control

8

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

2. Maxims of Equity Control

exists. Relief is compelled.

of formality.

must enter.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- "Equity regards that as done which ought to have been done." By refusing to adjudicate, this Court does not avoid duty; equity deems the relief already granted nunc pro tunc.
- "Silence is acquiescence; acquiescence is confession." Defendants' silence is not neutrality — it is admission.
- "Unrebutted affidavits stand as truth in commerce." Plaintiff's affidavits, unrebutted, are not allegations but established facts, binding in law and equity.

3. No Judicial Discretion Exists

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

These rules and maxims are not suggestions. They are mandates. Where Defendants refuse to defend, and where affidavits stand unrebutted, the Court has **no lawful discretion to withhold judgment.** To do so would be to act **ultra vires, in dishonor, and in fraud upon the Court.**

IV. ADJUDICATIVE DEMANDS

1. Defendants Are in Default

Proper service has been perfected and verified by affidavit (Dkts. 23, 44). Multiple summons were issued (Dkts. 24–40). No Defendant has filed an answer, responsive pleading, or motion to dismiss. No affidavit, declaration, or evidence has been submitted to rebut Plaintiff's **Verified** Complaint (Dkt. 47) or sworn affidavits (Dkts. 11, 14, 17, 20, 43, 44). Under **FRCP 55** and the maxims of commercial law, this silence is not neutral — it is **tacit confession and admission of liability.** Default is automatic.

2. No Genuine Dispute of Material Fact Exists

Every material fact in this case has been sworn, filed, and served. None have been rebutted. **FRCP 56(a)** mandates entry of summary judgment where no genuine dispute exists. In equity and commerce, **unrebutted affidavits are conclusive proof**. The Defendants' silence eliminates any triable issue. There is nothing left for a jury to decide. Judgment must be entered now, as a matter of law.

3. Relief Is Compelled in Equity

- Plaintiff has demonstrated:
 - O Irreparable harm continuing to compound;
 - No adequate remedy at law, as damages cannot remedy ongoing constitutional violations;
 - O Verified affidavits of fact and service, unrebutted and thus binding;
- The Winter v. NRDC factors satisfied in full (Dkt. 46).
- 4. Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy. Where law fails, equity commands. The Court's refusal to act compounds injury and confirms the need for immediate judgment.

5. Judicial Default Confirms Plaintiff's Entitlement

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Court's continued silence on Plaintiff's pending <u>Verified</u> Motion for Injunctive Relief (Dkt. 46) constitutes constructive denial of justice and obstruction. Judicial silence is judicial default. Under FRCP 54(c), judgment must grant the relief to which Plaintiff is entitled, regardless of whether Defendants resist. With no opposition, no defense, and no factual dispute, relief is compelled as a matter of right, not discretion.

V. CONCLUSION

The record is clear: Defendants were properly served, noticed, and afforded opportunity to respond. They have failed to answer, rebut, or defend. Plaintiff has filed multiple Verified Affidavits (Dkts. 11, 14, 17, 20, 43, 44) and a 116-page Amended Verified Complaint (Dkt. 47), all unrebutted and therefore binding as truth in law and commerce. Under controlling precedent, unrebutted facts must be taken as established. *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981) ("Uncontested affidavits are taken as true."). The Supreme Court has long held that default operates as an admission of liability. *Thomson* v. Wooster, 114 U.S. 104, 113 (1885) ("A default ... is an admission of all the well-pleaded allegations of the complaint."). Likewise, Nishimatsu Constr. Co. v. Houston Nat'l Bank, 515 F.2d 1200, 1206 (5th Cir. 1975) confirms that default establishes the defendant's liability "as a matter of law." Where no genuine dispute of material fact exists, summary judgment is not optional but mandatory. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986) ("Rule 56 mandates the entry of summary judgment ... against a party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case."). Here, Defendants have made no showing at all. Equity equally demands judgment. Payne v. Hook, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 425, 430 (1868) affirms

"A court of equity ... will never suffer a wrong without a remedy." Plaintiff has

that federal courts sitting in equity must provide relief where legal remedies are inadequate:

securing claims against all property, accounts, and holdings of Defendants.

28

	1		
1		0	Immediate liquidation of Defendants' assets to satisfy the judgment in full.
2	4.	Per	manent Injunction Against Defendants
3		0	Prohibiting Defendants, their agents, and assigns from engaging in further fraud ,
4			extortion, coercion, retaliation, or unlawful interference with Plaintiff's rights,
5			liberty, and property.
6		0	Ordering the immediate cessation of all unlawful acts affecting Plaintiff.
7	5.	Coı	npensatory and Treble Damages
8		0	Full restitution for all property, assets, and funds unlawfully seized, converted, or
9			transferred.
10		0	Treble damages under applicable statutes, including RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)),
11			for organized and systemic violations.
12	6.	Dec	elaratory Judgment Affirming Defendants' Liability
13		0	Declaring all fraudulent claims, filings, and instruments asserted by Defendants to
14			be null, void, and without lawful force.
15		0	Affirming Defendants' willful violations of federal and state law, constitutional
16			rights, and duties of office, entitling Plaintiff to full equitable and legal relief.
17	7.	Any	Additional Relief Deemed Just and Proper
18		0	Including but not limited to full restoration of rights, remedies, and protections
19			obstructed by Defendants' unlawful conduct.
20	//		
21	//		
22	//		
23	//		
24	//		
25	//		
26	//		
27	//		
28	//		

Case	5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 48 Filed 08/17/25 Page 10 of 14 Page ID #:1745
1	VERIFICATION:
2	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746
3	I, <u>Kevin: Realworldfare</u> , over the age of 18, competent to testify, and having firsthand knowledge
4	of the facts stated herein, do hereby declare, certify, verify, affirm, and state under penalty of
5	perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing statements are true,
6	correct, and complete, to the best of my understanding, knowledge, and belief, and made in
7	good faith.
8	Executed, signed, and sealed this 14th day of August in the year of Our Lord two thousand and
9	twenty five, without the United States.
10	All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.
11	By: Keyri Karlujostoffax
12	Kevin: Realworldfare, Real Party In Interest,
13	Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party
14	//
15	//
16	//
17	
18	//
19	//
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Page 10 of 14 VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 34, 55, AND 36

LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:

- 2 1. Exhibit A: Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact
- 3 2.Exhibit B: Hold Harmless Agreement

1

- 4 3. Exhibit C: Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC1 filing #2024385925-4.
- 5 | 4. E**xhibit D:** Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC3 filing #**#2024402990-2** .
- 6 5. E Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF775820621US, titled: NOTICE OF
- 7 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING,
- 8 CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW,
- 9 IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON.
- 10 6. Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #RF775821088US, titled: NOTICE OF
- 11 DEFAULT, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF
- 12 RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION,
- 13 COERCION, TREASON
- 14 | 7. Exhibit G: Contract Security Agreement #RF775822582US, titled: NOTICE OF
- 15 DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE <u>AND</u> NOTICE OF FRAUD,
- 16 RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE
- 17 COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION,
- 18 KIDNAPPING.
- 19 8. Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US, titled: Affidavit
- 20 Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, **DEFAULT**, JUDGEMENT, and **LIEN**
- 21 AUTHORIZATION.
- 22 9. Exhibit I: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E.
- 23 10. **Exhibit J**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.
- 24 11. **Exhibit K**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
- 25 12. Exhibit L: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.
- 26 | 13. Exhibit M: INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024
- 27 | 14. Exhibit N: Copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' 28 | #RF661448567US.

- 1 | 15.**Exhibit O**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Gregory D Eastwood.
- 2 | 16. **Exhibit P**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Robert C V Bowman.
- 3 | 17. Exhibit Q: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Willam Pratt.
- 4 | 18. Exhibit R: Affidavit 'Right to Travel': CANCELLATION, TERMINATION, AND
- 5 REVOCATION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT
- 6 and AGREEMENT. LICENSE/BOND # B6735991
- 7 | 19. **Exhibit S:** Revocation Termination and Cancelation of Franchise.
- 8 20. Exhibit T: CITATION/BOND #TE464702, accepted under threat, duress, and coercion.
- $0 \parallel$ 21. E**xhibit U:** Private Transport's PRIVATE PLATE displayed on the automobile
- 11 | 22. E**xhibit V:** Copy of "Automobile" and "commercial vehicle" defined by DMV (Department of Motor Vehicles).
- 13 23. Exhibit W: Copy of CA CODE § 260 from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov.
- 14 24. Exhibit X: national/non-citizen national passport card #C35510079.
- 15 25. Exhibit Y: national/non-citizen national passport book #A39235161.
- 16 || 26.**Exhibit Z**: ™KEVIN LEWIS WALKER© Copyright and Trademark Agreement.
- 17 | 27. **Exhibit AA:** A copy of American Bar Association's 'Attorney In Fact' Definition.
- 18 28. Exhibit BB: A Copy of Rule 8.4: (Misconduct) of the American Bar Association.
- 29. Exhibit CC: Twenty-six 3811 forms showing Defendants' acceptance of service
 of all documents via USPS and electronic service, including SUMMONS and
 COMPLAINT.

23 | //

24 || 1

25 || //

26 || //

27

28 ||

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2 3 SS. COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 4 I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within 5 action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, care of: 30650 Rancho 6 California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about August 8 **14, 2025**, I served the within documents: **VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY AND DEFAULT** 9 1. JUDGMENT IN EQUITY, AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL RULES 10 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 54, 55, AND 56 11 By Electronic Service. Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or an 12 13 agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below. 14 Steven-Arthur: Sherman C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN, FERGUSON PRAET & 15 SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 16 1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] ssherman@law4cops.com 17 csherman@law4cops.com 18 19 Chad: Bianco, Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas Gruwell, 20 C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor 21 Riverside, California [92501] ssherman@law4cops.com 22 csherman@law4cops.com rsoscscentral@riversidesheriff.org 23 isinz@riversidesheriff.org wpratt@riversidesheriff.org 24 25 Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, **SOUTHWEST** 26 JUSTICE CENTER 27 3960 Orange Street Riverside, California [92501] 28

Filed 08/17/25 Page 14 of 14 Page ID

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 48